

PATENT  
450101-02537

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance.

#### I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 1-14 are currently pending. Claims 1, 4-6, and 10-13 are independent.

#### II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

The present Office Action maintains the 35 U.S.C. §103 rejection of the prior action dated March 24, 2005 that claims 1-14 are unpatentable over the combination of Driscoll et al. (6,593,969), Martin (6,243,131), and where applicable, Adams (5,652,621). Applicants respectfully suggest that the Examiner has misunderstood the arguments made in reply to the prior Office Action.

Independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

picture image conversion means for eliminating distortion . . . of the picture image . . . and for converting it into high quality picture image.  
(Emphasis added)

As understood by Applicants, Martin discloses that a sensor array 22 is a CMOS APS, CID or a CCD sensor array and an image transform processor 24 corrects predetermined distortions introduced by the sensor array 22.

The Office Action makes an equivalence between Martin's sensor array 22 and image transform processor 24 with the present application's image pick-up means and picture image

00319758

PATENT  
450101-02537

conversion means, respectively. The Office Action then cites Martin for teaching, “[b]y incorporating the image transform processor 24 of the present invention with a CMOS APS array or a CID array, increased image resolution is provided.” Col. 8, lines 62-65.

However, Applicants submit that Martin is only disclosing that a higher resolution image is inputted into the image transform processor when the image itself is obtained by, or captured from, a CMOS APS or CID array as opposed to a CCD array. This is confirmed by the discussion in Martin at column 9 lines 22-35.

Thus, in Martin a higher quality picture image is achieved by using a CMOS APS or CID array rather than a CCD array for providing input to the picture image conversion means. Hence, the picture image conversion means of Martin corrects for predetermined distortions in a picture image outputted from the sensor array but does not also provide a higher quality of that picture image. If a CMOS APS or CID array is used, the quality of the image derived from that CMOS APS or CID array will be better than the quality of the image derived from a CCD array. But this has nothing to do with Martin’s image transform processor.

In contrast, in the present application the output of the image pick-up means is stored in the memory means. Claim 1 recites, “picture image conversion means for eliminating distortion . . . of the picture image . . . and for converting it into high quality picture image.” The picture image conversion means provides a higher quality picture image of the picture image that is stored in the memory. It is the picture image conversion means that provides the high quality picture image.

Accordingly, in the present invention the picture image conversion means not only removes distortion but also provides a high quality picture image from the output of the image

00319758

PATENT  
450101-02537

pick-up means whereas in Martin the high quality picture image is provided by selection of the image pick-up means.

Claim 1 is not obvious over the cited art because the art does not teach or suggest a “picture image conversion means . . . for converting [the picture image] into a high quality picture image” as recited in the claim.

For reasons similar to those described above, independent claims 4, 5, 12, and 13 are also believed to be patentable.

Applicants respectfully submit that Adams does not provide the support missing in Driscoll and Martin, and, therefore, independent claims 6, 10, and 11 are also believed to be patentable for similar reasons as those described above.

### III. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims are dependent from one of the claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

### CONCLUSION

Claims 1-14 are in condition for allowance. In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosure in the cited reference, or references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the reference, or references, providing the basis for a contrary view.

00319758

PATENT  
450101-02537

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our  
Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in  
this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the  
present application.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP  
Attorneys for Applicants

By:

  
William S. Frommer  
Reg. No. 25,506  
(212) 588-0800

00319758